



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/750,145	12/31/2003	Peiqi Jiang	ESSR:076US	7917
32425	7590	12/05/2006	EXAMINER	
WOLLSCHLAGER, JEFFREY MICHAEL				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
		1732		

DATE MAILED: 12/05/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/750,145	JIANG ET AL.
	Examiner Jeff Wollschlager	Art Unit 1732

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 December 2003.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-43 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-43 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 31 December 2003 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

Claims 9 and 10 are objected to for the following informalities: The claims do not use consistent nomenclature for specifying the claimed pressure ranges. Claim 9 recites "10 kPa to 350 kPa" (emphasis added) whereas claim 10 recites "30 to 150 kPa". Claim 34 is objected to because it recites, "the said main face". Appropriate correction is required. Claims 29 and 35 are objected to because the claims are directed to identical subject matter.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-43 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-33 of U.S. Patent No. 6,562,466.

Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other.

Claim 1 of U.S. Patent 6,562,466 claims the process for transferring a coating onto a surface of a lens blank comprising: providing a lens blank having at least one geometrically defined surface wherein the definition of geometrically defined provided in the specification includes a surface that is fined but unpolished; providing a support/mold part having an internal surface bearing a coating and an external surface; depositing on said geometrically defined surface or said coating a premeasured amount of curable glue (e.g. liquid curable coating composition); moving relative to each other the lens blank and the support; applying a sufficient pressure so that the thickness of a final glue layer is less than 100 micrometers; curing the glue; withdrawing the support/mold part and recovering the lens blank.

Regarding claims 1-43, instant claim 1 and claim 1 of the '466 patent are not patentably distinct from each other because the instant claim is merely a broader version of the patented claim. Therefore, the claims are not patentably distinct therefrom, since they are effectively anticipated by the patented claims. The examiner notes two interpretations of the claims. In one interpretation the "liquid curable coating" of the instant claims is anticipated by the curable glue claimed by the '466 patent. In another interpretation, the glue of the '466 patent is an additional material employed beyond those materials positively found in the instant claims and/or is a component of the coating layer (col. 3, lines 5-16 of the '466 patent).

Claims 1-43 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 22-64 of copending Application No. 10/838,840. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other.

Claim 22 of 10/838,840 claims the process for transferring a coating from a support onto a surface of a polymer material substrate comprising: providing a polymer material substrate having at least one main surface; providing a support having an internal surface bearing a coating and an external surface; depositing on the main surface of the substrate or on the coating a pre-measured amount of a curable composition comprising, based on the total weight of polymerizable monomer and/or oligomers of the composition:

(A1) 20 to 80 wt% of at least one diacrylate monomer or oligomer thereof

(A2) 80 to 20 wt% of at least one polyalkoxylated bisphenol dimethacrylate or oligomer thereof;

(B) 0 to 50 wt% of at least one copolymerizable monomer different from components (A1) and (A2); with the proviso that the composition is free from any thio(meth)acrylate, (-SCOCR' = CH₂, with R' = H or CH₃) monomer or oligomer thereof; moving relatively to each other the substrate and the support to either bring the coating into contact with the curable composition or bring the curable composition into contact with the main surface of the substrate; applying a sufficient pressure onto the external surface of the support so that the thickness of a final layer, once the curable composition has cured is less than 100 micrometers; curing the layer of the

Art Unit: 1732

composition to form a final cured layer; and withdrawing the support to recover a substrate with the coating adhered onto its main surface.

Regarding claims 1-43, instant claim 1 and claim 22 of the '840 application are not patentably distinct from each other because the instant claim is merely a broader version of the copending claim. Therefore, they are not patentably distinct therefrom, since the claim is effectively anticipated by the copending claim.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Claims 1-43 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 20-62 of copending Application No. 10/862,693. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other.

Claim 20 of 10/862,693 claims a process comprising: providing a thermoplastic material substrate having at least one main surface; providing a support having an internal surface bearing a coating and an external surface; depositing on the main surface of the substrate or on the coating a pre-measured amount of a curable adhesive composition comprising, based on total weight of photopolymerizable monomer and/or oligomers of the composition:

5 to 60 wt% of at least one mono or polyacrylate monomer or oligomer thereof, (A);

5 to 50 wt% of at least one thio(meth)acrylate monomer or oligomer thereof, (B);

and

20 to 50 wt% of at least one aromatic dimethacrylate monomer or oligomer thereof, (C); with the proviso that the composition does not contain a brominated monofunctional acrylate;

moving relatively to each other the substrate and the support to either bring the coating into contact with the curable adhesive composition or bring the curable adhesive composition into contact with the main surface of the substrate; applying a sufficient pressure onto the external surface of the support so that the thickness of a final adhesive layer, once the curable adhesive composition has cured is less than 100 micrometers; curing the layer of adhesive composition; and withdrawing the support to recover a substrate with the coating adhered onto its main surface.

Regarding claims 1-43, instant claim 1 and claim 20 of the '693 application are not patentably distinct from each other because the instant claim is merely a broader version of the copending claim. Therefore, they are not patentably distinct therefrom, since the claim is effectively anticipated by the copending claim.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Claims 1-43 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 25-38 of

copending Application No. 10/861,580. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other.

Claim 25 of the '580 application claims a process for forming at least one coating layer on a toric surface of an optical article which comprises: providing an optical article having a toric surface comprising a first principal meridian with a lower radius of curvature r and a second principal meridian with a higher radius of curvature R ($r < R$) and a periphery; depositing on said toric surface of the optical article a pre-measured amount of a liquid curable composition; applying pressure on said pre-measured amount of liquid curable composition to cause said liquid curable composition to spread over the toric surface of the optical article; curing the liquid curable composition; and recovering an optical article coated with at least one coating layer; wherein, the liquid curable composition deposition step comprises depositing on the toric surface at least two drops of the liquid curable composition, each within one of two opposite sectors centered on the first principal meridian of lower radius of curvature r and having an apex angle up to 40° wherein the pressure application step comprises: providing a mold part having an internal and an external surface; moving relatively to each other the optical article and the mold part to bring the internal face of the mold part into contact with the liquid curable composition; and applying pressure on the external face of the mold part.

Regarding claims 1-43, instant claim 1 and claim 25 of the '580 application are not patentably distinct from each other because the instant claim is merely a broader

version of the copending claim. Therefore, they are not patentably distinct therefrom, since the claim is effectively anticipated by the copending claim.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claims 1 and 36 recite "the internal face" in step (iv). There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. For the purposes of examination, the recitation is understood to be "the internal surface". Further, the preamble of claim 1 refers to an "optical lens blank" whereas the body of the claim refers to an optical article. It is unclear what limiting effect this has on the claims. For example, claims 27, 29, 31 and 32 depend from claim 1 and recite different optical articles including lens blanks, lens molds and a lens. Claims 1 and 36 are indefinite because the limiting effect of the recitation, "fined but unpolished" is unclear.

Claim 14 recites the "flexible plastic material". There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. Claim 32 is indefinite because it is unclear whether the tinted optical article is a tinted lens or a tinted lens blank. Claim 4 is indefinite because the term "flexible" in claim 4 is a relative term which renders the claim

indefinite. The term "flexible" is not defined by the claim, the specification does not provide a standard for ascertaining the requisite degree for the broad recitation found in claim 4, and one of ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably apprised of the scope of the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-7, 13, 15-20, 26-28, 30, 32, 34, 36, 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Gupta et al. (U.S. Patent 5,512,371; issued April 30, 1996).

Regarding claims 1 and 36, Gupta et al. teach a process for transferring a coating onto a surface of a lens preform comprising: providing a finished or semi-finished optical preform having at least one geometrically defined surface (col. 3, lines 25-36, element (11)); providing a mold part (13) having an internal surface and an external surface; depositing a liquid curable moving coating composition of optical resin

Art Unit: 1732

between the mold and the preform; moving relative to each other the preform and the mold; necessarily applying sufficient pressure to spread the liquid curable coating resin; curing the resin; withdrawing the mold and recovering the coated article (col. 4, lines 26-60; col. 5, lines 13-20 and 28-45 and 60-64; col. 6, lines 57-60).

As to claim 2, Gupta et al. teach the liquid is cured under pressure (col. 5, lines 28-45).

As to claim 3, Gupta et al. teach the mold part is glass or metal (col. 3, lines 11-24).

As to claims 4 and 13, Gupta et al. teach the mold is made of plastic (col. 3, lines 11-14). It is noted that plastic is more flexible than glass or metal.

As to claim 5, Gupta et al. teach the liquid is UV curable (col. 5, lines 60-66).

As to claims 6 and 7, Gupta et al. teach the mold part is uv-transparent plastic (col. 3, lines 11-14).

As to claims 15-20 and 37, the finished and/or semi-finished preform disclosed by Gupta et al. intrinsically has the same surface roughness and is made of polycarbonate (col. 3, lines 25-38).

As to claim 26, Gupta et al. teach the resin provides anti-scratch properties (col. 3, lines 1-9).

As to claims 27 and 34, Gupta et al. teach the main face of the preform may be the back face of the preform (col. 4, lines 35-41).

As to claims 28 and 30, Gupta et al. teach the optical article is a lens (col. 3, lines 25-38) and that the lens may be colored or coated with photochromatic materials (col. 4, lines 21-25).

As to claim 32, Gupta et al. teach the article is a lens preform (col. 3, lines 25-38).

Claims 1-28, 30, 32-34, 36 and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Jiang et al. (U.S. Patent 6,562,466; issued May 13, 2003; filed July 2, 2001).

Regarding claims 1 and 36, Jiang et al. teach a process for transferring a coating onto a surface of a lens blank comprising: providing a lens blank having at least one geometrically defined surface wherein the definition of geometrically defined provided in the specification includes a surface that is fined but unpolished; providing a support/mold part having an internal surface bearing a coating and an external surface; depositing on said geometrically defined surface or said coating a premeasured amount of curable glue (also a liquid curable coating composition); moving relative to each other the lens blank and the support; applying a sufficient pressure so that the thickness of a final glue layer is less than 100 micrometers; curing the glue; withdrawing the support/mold part and recovering the lens blank (claim 1; col. 2, line 47- col. 3, line 28).

As to claim 2, the liquid curable composition is cured under pressure (col. 3, lines 42-44).

As to claims 3, 4, 6, and 11-14 Jiang et al. employ rigid or flexible mold parts such as polycarbonate with a thickness of 0.3 to 1 mm and that can be in the form of a flexible membrane (col. 3, lines 44-46 and line 58-col. 4, lines 11)

As to claims 5 and 7, Jiang et al. employ uv transparent polycarbonate and a uv curable liquid coating glue (col. 3, lines 58- col. 4, lines 11; col. 6, lines 36-50).

As to claim 8, Jiang et al. teach the flexible part has a shorter radius of curvature than the surface of the blank to be coated (col. 4, lines 17-19).

As to claims 9 and 10, Jiang et al. teach a preferable pressure range of 5 to 20 psi (col. 3, lines 47-48).

As to claims 15-20 and 37, Jiang et al. teach the surface roughness of the optical article is from 10^{-3} micrometers to 1 micrometer (col. 3, lines 29-32) and that the optical article may be polycarbonate (col. 5, lines 1-10).

As to claims 21-24, Jiang et al. teach the total thickness of the coating to be transferred is preferred to be 10 micrometers or less (col. 4, lines 53-55) and that the thickness of the glue is usually 1 to 30 micrometers (col. 5, lines 1-3).

As to claim 25, Jiang et al. disclose the same claimed materials and the same claimed process. As such the refractive index difference between the lens blank and the cured coating are the same.

As to claims 26 and 28, Jiang et al. disclose employment of anti-abrasive coatings, tinted coatings, and anti-reflective coatings as conventional (col. 1, lines 15-22; col. 4, lines 45-53).

As to claims 27 and 34, Jiang et al. teach the main face of the lens blank is the back face of the lens blank (col. 11, lines 53-57).

As to claims 30 and 32, Jiang et al. disclose the article as a lens blank (col. 2, lines 54-55).

As to claim 33, Jiang et al. disclose a glass mold (col. 7, lines 1-3).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 29 and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jiang et al. (U.S. Patent 6,562,466; issued May 13, 2003; filed July 2, 2001), as

applied to claim 1-28, 30, 32-34, 36 and 37 above, further in view of Degand et al. (U.S. 6,489,028).

As to claims 29 and 35, Jiang et al. teach the method of claim 1 as discussed in the 102(e) rejection above, and further disclose anti-reflective coatings as conventional, but do not expressly teach applying anti-reflective coatings onto the cured coating. However, Degand et al. disclose that it is known to apply the anti-reflective coating to the cured surface of the lens (col. 6, lines 1-6).

Therefore it would have been *prima facie* obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the claimed invention to employ a known sequence of steps for applying the anti-reflective coating to the surface of the cured lens as taught by Degand et al. while practicing the method of Jiang et al. for the purpose as taught by Degand et al. of providing a lens that has excellent abrasion resistance while also having anti-reflective properties (col. 5, lines 38-col. 6, lines 9).

Claims 31 and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jiang et al. (U.S. Patent 6,562,466; issued May 13, 2003; filed July 2, 2001), as applied to claim 1-28, 30, 32-34, 36 and 37 above, further in view of Brytsche et al. (U.S. 5,753,301).

As to claims 31 and 38, Jiang et al. teach the method of claim 1 as discussed above, but do not expressly disclose the method is employed to coat a transparent lens mold. However, Brytsche et al. disclose that methods of coating lens, lens blanks and lens molds are known to be interchangeable and equivalent (Abstract).

Therefore, it would have been *prima facie* obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to utilize the method disclosed by Jiang et al. to coat a lens mold since Brytsche et al. disclose that lens molds, lens, and lens blanks may be coated through equivalent means. One having ordinary skill would have been motivated to maximize the applications of Jiang et al.'s method as suggested by the disclosure of the art-recognized equivalence of the materials.

Claim 39 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jiang et al. (U.S. Patent 6,562,466; issued May 13, 2003; filed July 2, 2001) in view of Brytsche et al. (U.S. 5,753,301), as applied to claim 38 above, and further in view of Friske et al. (U.S. Patent 5,254,000).

As to claim 39, Friske et al. disclose that lens molds made of polypropylene are conventional and preferred in the art (col. 2, lines 3-11).

Therefore it would have been *prima facie* obvious to employ conventional and preferred lens mold materials as taught by Friske et al. for the purpose of providing a lens mold that does not mold or distort when the lens is cured (col. 2, lines 3-11).

Claims 40 and 42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jiang et al. (U.S. Patent 6,562,466; issued May 13, 2003; filed July 2, 2001), as applied to claim 1-28, 30, 32-34, 36 and 37 above, further in view of Li et al. (U.S. 6,565,776).

As to claims 40 and 42, Jiang et al. teach the method of claims 1 and 36 as discussed above, but do not teach the mold part is precoated with a release or protective coating. However, Li et al. teach that it is known to provide lens mold parts with a protective coating (Abstract).

Therefore it would have been *prima facie* obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the claimed invention to provide a protective layer to the mold part disclosed by Jiang et al. as suggested by Li et al. for the purpose, as taught by Li et al., of producing a mold part with greater dimensional stability (Abstract).

Claims 41 and 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jiang et al. (U.S. Patent 6,562,466; issued May 13, 2003; filed July 2, 2001), as applied to claim 1-28, 30, 32-34, 36 and 37 above, further in view of Keller et al. (U.S. 6,491,851).

As to claims 41 and 43, Jiang et al. teach the method of claims 1 and 36 as discussed above but do not disclose a mold part having a microstructure or a pattern to be duplicated in the lens blank. However, Keller et al. disclose a mold part having a microstructure or a pattern to be duplicated in the lens blank (Abstract).

Therefore it would have been *prima facie* obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to employ a mold part with a microstructured surface as disclosed by Keller et al. to produce a lens with improved anti-glare properties, as suggested by Keller et al. (Abstract).

Claims 9, 10, 12, 14, 29 and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Gupta et al. (U.S. Patent 5,512,371; issued April 30, 1996).

As to claim 9 and 10, Gupta et al. do not disclose the claimed pressure. However, the applied pressure would impact the application of the coating, the thickness of the coating, and if not properly controlled, would result in a damaged or broken lens preform. As such, the applied pressure would have been readily optimized as is routinely practiced in the art.

As to claims 12 and 14, Gupta et al. do not disclose the mold thickness or whether the plastic mold comprises polycarbonate or PMMA. However, one having ordinary skill would have been motivated to employ conventional mold parts and dimensions as suggested by Gupta (col. 3, lines 22-24).

As to claims 29 and 35, anti-reflective coatings are conventional in the art.

Conclusion

All claims are rejected.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jeff Wollschlager whose telephone number is 571-272-8937. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday 7:00 - 4:45, alternating Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Christina Johnson can be reached on 571-272-1176. The fax phone

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

JW

Jeff Wollschlager
Examiner
Art Unit 1732

November 27, 2006


CHRISTINA JOHNSON
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

12/1/04